

Hoyer	Moakley	Serrano
Hunter	Mollohan	Sisisky
Jackson-Lee	Montgomery	Skaggs
Jacobs	Moran	Spence
Jefferson	Murtha	Spratt
Johnson (SD)	Nadler	Stark
Johnson, E.B.	Neal	Stenholm
Johnston	Oberstar	Studds
Kanjorski	Obey	Stump
Kennedy (MA)	Olver	Stupak
Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Tanner
Kennelly	Owens	Tauzin
Kildee	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
Klecza	Pastor	Taylor (NC)
Klink	Payne (NJ)	Tejeda
LaFalce	Payne (VA)	Thompson
Lantos	Pelosi	Thurman
Levin	Peterson (FL)	Torres
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Torricelli
Lipinski	Pickett	Towns
Lowey	Pombo	Trafficant
Luther	Pomeroy	Tucker
Maloney	Poshard	Velazquez
Manton	Rahall	Vento
Markey	Rangel	Visclosky
Mascara	Reed	Volkmer
Matsui	Richardson	Ward
McCarthy	Rivers	Waters
McDermott	Roemer	Watt (NC)
McHale	Rohrabacher	Waxman
McKinney	Roukema	Williams
McNulty	Roysal-Allard	Wilson
Meek	Rush	Wise
Menendez	Sabo	Wolf
Mfume	Sanders	Woolsey
Miller (CA)	Sawyer	Wyden
Mineta	Schroeder	Wynn
Minge	Schumer	
Mink	Scott	

NOT VOTING—29

Bono	Gibbons	Reynolds
Brown (FL)	Hayes	Ros-Lehtinen
Chapman	Hayworth	Scarborough
Chrysler	Hefner	Schaefer
Collins (MI)	Kaptur	Slaughter
Conyers	Lincoln	Souder
Creameans	Lofgren	Stokes
Davis	Meehan	Yates
Dornan	Orton	Young (AK)
Flake	Porter	

□ 1018

Messrs. DINGELL, MORAN, McHALE, MONTGOMERY, BALDACCI, and PALLONE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MYRICK and Messrs. QUINN, McHUGH and SOLOMON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. WILSON changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Would the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD] please come forward to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WHITFIELD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this ses-

sion, the House adopted a new rule which says the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks made during the proceedings of the House, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the Member making the remarks involved.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we received this morning, reflecting yesterday's proceedings, at page H301 in the transcript of the remarks of the Speaker pro tempore, the gentleman from Florida, there are two changes that were made between what he, in fact, said and what is in the RECORD.

The first change is as follows:

He said yesterday with regard to the statements of the gentlewoman from Florida about the book of the Speaker, "It is the Speaker's opinion that innuendo and personal references to the Speaker's conduct are not in order."

That has been altered and that does not appear verbatim in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Instead, it says, "It is the Speaker's opinion that innuendo and critical references to the Speaker's personal conduct are not in order."

Additionally, later on in response to a parliamentary inquiry from the gentleman from Missouri, the Speaker pro tempore said, as I recollect it, "it has been the Chair's ruling, and the precedents of the House support this, a higher level of respect is due to the Speaker."

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that has been changed to "a proper level of respect."

Now, I do not believe that changing "personal" to "critical" and "proper" to "higher" is either technical, grammatical, or typographical. Both make quite substantive changes. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that by the standard that the Speaker yesterday uttered, the gentlewoman from Florida was judged, but if you take today's standard of revised, illegitimately revised version that is in the RECORD, there would be no objection to what the gentlewoman from Florida said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair might respond to the gentleman.

The Chair would recite from the manual that in accordance with existing accepted practices, the Speaker may make such technical or parliamentary insertions, or corrections in transcript as may be necessary to conform to rule, custom, or precedent. The Chair does not believe that any revision changed the meaning of the ruling.

The Chair would under the circumstances inform the House on behalf of the Parliamentarian that the new rule is as it might apply to the role of the Chair will be examined.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled, and I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The Speaker cited previous references to the House rules and manual. That predates the rules change adopted this year. This is not simply a case of making a technical change in a ruling. We are talking also about substantive changes in the debate in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has made it very clear, the Chair would say to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No, the Chair has not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has made it clear that the Parliamentarian plans to examine this issue.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. In the first instance, I thought the Speaker was the responsible ruler in this situation, while the Parliamentarian advised him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Second, I want to know, are you telling me that this new change in which you say that it has to be verbatim, in fact, does not mean that, because two very important changes were made in the transcript from yesterday to today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has informed the gentleman that this issue is going to be examined in consultation with the Parliamentarian.

Mr. DINGELL. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. Can you inform this Member and the House of what the meaning of the reexamination is?

You are informing the House that the issue is going to be reexamined. Yesterday the Speaker then presiding made a ruling which now appears in the precedents of the House. It interpreted the precedents of the House. It related to the rights, the behaviors, the dignities of the Members, and it dictated the future course of conduct of Members of this body.

Is the Chair informing us that the rulings of the Chair yesterday stand, that the rulings of the Chair yesterday have been changed without approval by the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the Chair might respond to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to persist in my parliamentary inquiry. Or that the rulings of the Chair of yesterday are going to be reexamined?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must reiterate that the principles of decorum in debate relied on by the Chair yesterday with respect to words taken down are not new to the 104th Congress.

First, clause 1 of rule XIV establishes an absolute rule against engaging in personality in debate where the subject